CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA
REGULAR MEETING

JUNE 7, 2011

INVOCATION:
Pastor Rick Bloom of Pacific Christian Church gave the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:
Councilmember Boysen led the Pledge of Allegiance.

CALL TO ORDER:
Mayor Lavagnino called the Regular Meeting of the City Council to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL:
MEMBERS PRESENT
Councilmembers Boysen, Cordero, Orach, Patino, and Mayor Lavagnino.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT
City Manager Ness, City Attorney Trujillo, Assistant City Manager Haydon, Fire Chief Jones, Police Chief Macagni, Director of Public Works/City Engineer Whitehead, Director of Utilities Sweet, Director of Community Development Appel, Director of Administrative Services Visé, Director of Recreation and Parks Posada, Planner III Shipsey, and Chief Deputy City Clerk Perez.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Lisa Wilkerson showed a short KSBY film clip regarding her book *The Big Orange Day* containing pictures of the Central Coast. She explained her inspiration for the book was the tragedy of losing her brother in a fire. She presented two copies of the book to the City and said she was dedicating the book to the City of Santa Maria.

Parvaneh Givi, Muscular Dystrophy Association, thanked the Fire Firefighters Local 2020 for their support in the "Fill The Boot" fundraiser which raised over $12,000. Local 2020 was named one of the top 100 in the Country for the amount of money raised.

William Hardisty spoke about the new green waste program. He said he represented 208 retired people at Rancho Buena Vista. Some of the people were having a difficult time just paying their regular water bills. He explained that they had gardeners who hauled away their green waste and didn't need the green waste program. He asked for some type of dispensation.

Bob Ziener said the City of Santa Maria needed to be complimented for the great turnout at the Elks Parade even though it was raining. He spoke about the importance of developing a "think tank" for the City to provide innovative ideas.

Henry Cerdas requested that the City provide a free petting zoo at Waller Park.

Lisa Thornhill, League of Women Voters, stated they have republished their pamphlet "Know Your Town" and thanked the City Manager and staff for assisting them with information. She presented copies to the Council.

Nancy Stewart stated at the next meeting the Council would be discussing the City budget. Her concern was that the budget would include cuts again this year, and it could mean a huge cut for the Police Department. With the increase in population and the increase in crime and gangs, the Police Department would be challenged to provide services. She asked the public to contact their Councilmembers and let them know their concerns before the next meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Councilmember Boysen asked to pull Item 3I for comment. Mayor Lavagnino pulled Item 3J for comment.

Item 3I – Federal Chip Seal and Street Light Replacement
Councilmember Boysen complimented Public Works Director Whitehead for his report and his explanation of the importance of chip sealing. He asked if there was a way to get that information out to the public.

Item 3J – Award of Bid for NE Fire Station No. 5
Mayor Lavagnino stated when Fire Station No. 5 was completed, it would fulfill the Council's promise to the residents of the City that the response time from the Fire Department would be five minutes or less 90 percent of the time.

Consent Calendar Items 3A through 3J were approved on motion by Councilmember Orach, seconded by Councilmember Patino, and carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Boysen, Cordero, Orach, Patino, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

A. ORDINANCES
The reading in full of all ordinances and resolutions was waived. Ordinances on the Consent Calendar were adopted by the same vote cast at the first reading unless City Council indicated otherwise.

B. MINUTES
The Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting of May 17, 2011, were approved as submitted.

C. RETENTION SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS
Resolution No. 2011-62 was adopted approving amendments to the City-wide Records Retention Schedule for numerous departments.

Resolution No. 2011-62 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE CITY-WIDE RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE.

D. WARRANTS
Warrant Nos. 166087 to 166345 totaling $3,366,381.17 were ordered ratified subject to having been certified as being in conformity with the budget and having been approved for payment by the Director of Administrative Services. Warrant Nos. 1662250, 166226, 166227, and 166282 were cancelled.

E. PAYROLL
Payment of payroll was ordered ratified subject to having been certified by the proper Department Heads, as shown on records on file in the Department of Administrative Services and having been approved for payment by the Director of Administrative Services.

F. NOTICE OF CONTRACT COMPLETION
The City Council accepted the public improvements and approved the Notice of Contract Completion for Target Area 3B Streetlight Improvements, Bid No. 2010/04, and directed the Chief Deputy City Clerk to record the Notice.

G. CALL FOR BIDS
The City Council gave approval to call for bids on the plans and specifications for 2011 Street Overlay, Bid No. 2011/09.

H. CALL FOR BIDS
The City Council gave approval to call for bids on the plans and specifications for Veteran's Memorial Community Center – Parking Lot Rehabilitation, Bid No. 2011/07.

I. AWARD OF BID

Resolution No. 2011-63 was adopted awarding the bid and approving an agreement with Graham Contractors, Inc., for Federal Stimulus Chip Seal & Street Light Replacement, including Additive Alternate B, Bid No. 2010/14, in the amount of $533,368.16.

Resolution No. 2011-63 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A CONTRACT WITH GRAHAM CONTRACTORS, INC., FOR FEDERAL STIMULUS CHIP SEAL & STREET LIGHT REPLACEMENT, BID NO. 2010/14.

J. AWARD OF BID

Resolution No. 2011-64 was adopted awarding the bid and approving an agreement with Pacific-Mountain Contractors of California, Inc., for Northeast Fire Station No. 5, Bid No. 2011/06, in the amount of $2,343,000.

Resolution No. 2011-64 adopted. A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MARIA, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A CONTRACT WITH PACIFIC-MOUNTAIN CONTRACTORS OF CALIFORNIA, INC., FOR THE NORTHEAST FIRE STATION NO. 5, BID NO. 2011/06.

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL DIRECTION REGARDING A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED SIENA APARTMENT PROJECT.

City Manager Ness gave the staff report. It is recommended that the City Council hear a presentation from Mr. Michael Towbes, and his associates, for a development agreement for his proposed Siena apartment project consisting of 211 market-rate rental apartments. Afterward, it is recommended that Council decline to proceed with the proposed development agreement. The property for the Siena project consists of 10.75 acres located at the northwest corner of Blosser Road and Sonya Lane within the Blosser-Southwest Specific Plan. As early as March 2009, Mr. Michael Towbes expressed interest in discussing fee deferrals and reductions for his proposed project. Staff has been engaged with Mr. Towbes in discussing his interest in pursuing a development agreement to accomplish these fee deferrals and reductions since then.

Mr. Towbes would like the Council to provide direction to staff to favorably process his proposed development agreement. While staff listed 10 reasons in the agenda report for not supporting the development agreement, only the main concerns will be highlighted.

As staff understands Mr. Towbes' proposal, it includes a request for deferring the payment of Growth Mitigation Fees for a period of three years from the last certificate of occupancy for the project (estimated to be five years after the start of construction). The current Growth Mitigation Fees for City Hall, Corporation Yard, Fire, Library, Police, Recreation and Parks, and Traffic are estimated to be approximately $1.83 million for this project. The request for deferral of Growth Mitigation Fees is proposed to apply to all development fees except State Water Reimbursement fees. Water and Wastewater development fees could be another $1.5 million, for a total of $3.34 million in deferred fees. Additionally, the development agreement asks for 30 percent reductions for Recreation and Parks, Traffic, Wastewater and Water Connection developer fees which would amount to approximately $774,000 overall reduction in Growth Mitigation Fees. Mr. Towbes makes the argument that he is providing amenities on site and has already created the public infrastructure necessary to support the project.

Mr. Towbes proposes to secure the payment of Growth Mitigation Fees by providing a second trust deed on the property behind the construction loan; and to pay it off when the permanent loan is put on the property or when the property is sold to an unrelated third party, whichever occurs first. This is not acceptable to staff. Mr. Towbes steadfastly refused to discuss any other form of security up until yesterday morning when he indicated he would be open to discussing it. If Council decides to move forward with the development agreement, staff recommends that a bond, letter of credit, or a certificate of deposit be the only forms of security approved for construction projects such as this. A second trust deed will not provide adequate security.

If the Council were to grant fee deferrals and reductions for this residential project, staff predicts that applicants for every future residential project will make the same request. If Councilmembers feel compelled to grant each such request, it will be impossible to deliver ordinary municipal services to future City residents. Mr. Towbes refutes this contention by saying the City could just apply the deferral to market-rate rental units. Staff believes there would be nothing preventing other residential developers from asking for the same concessions. Developers of affordable housing projects would probably be the first ones to take advantage of such an precedent. The City has never offered reductions or deferrals in Growth Mitigation Fees to affordable housing projects.

Mr. Towbes' request is not allowed in the Municipal Code and is more than what the City would be able to provide to an affordable housing project. Mr. Towbes has specifically refused to include an affordable housing component of any kind with the Siena project. Municipal Code Chapter 12-48 provides incentives for certain housing projects, one of which is to allow the developer to pay development impact fees over a period of time not to exceed three years in equal installments. Mr. Towbes is asking to pay developer fees three years after project completion. To qualify for a fee postponement incentive under the City's Municipal Code, a project must include minimum percentages of units reserved either for lower income households, very low income households, or senior housing, which Mr. Towbes is not proposing. Staff requested that a minimum of 10 percent of the units be reserved for income-restricted tenants. Mr. Towbes refused to discuss staff's request.

Staff recommends that Council deny Mr. Towbes' request for a development agreement. If Mr. Towbes' project is financially infeasible to pursue at this time without the City's financial support, perhaps now is not the time for the project to be pursued. If that is the case, the City would not be faced with the demands for more public services which would be created by this project. In two weeks, City staff will be presenting to the Council budget reduction recommendations associated with the second year of the City's two-year budget. Staff is proposing another reduction to the General Fund of $2.4 million which includes eliminating funding for some 23 positions.

Mayor Lavagnino, and Councilmembers Patino, Boysen, and Cordero announced that they met with Mr. Towbes, Jon Martin, and Laurie Tamura. Councilmember Orach stated he had a brief telephone conversation with Mr. Towbes and Ms. Tamura.

Mayor Lavagnino stated one of the things that the City needed to pursue was a fee structure for processing development agreements because staff had already spent a great deal of time on this with no compensation. He asked if the requested deferral was for three years after the last unit was built for approximately five years, or three years from the start of construction.

City Manager Ness stated as he understood the proposal, Mr. Towbes was asking for a fee deferral for three years after construction of the last unit which would be a range of three to five years.

Michael Towbes addressed the Council. He stated he has been building for more than 55 years including more than 2,000 apartment units. In all those years, they have never asked for a deferral of developer fees for market-rate apartments. The reason they were asking for a deferral for the Siena project was because Santa Maria had the highest developers fees and the lowest rents of any community in which they build. It was a challenge to build market-rate apartments. The Country is in the worst recession since the Great Depression, and the housing market would be the last to recover. The construction industry had been hit very hard. Siena would be a $30 million project which would have a positive impact on the community now when it is badly needed. Besides Siena providing affordable workforce housing and providing a major benefit to the construction industry, it would be part of a larger project which included the Westgate Ranch shopping center. There needed to be more people living in that area before major retailers would move into that shopping center.

The development agreement was never intended to be a final document. It was to be a starting point. They would like to engage staff in a meaningful discussion about an agreement that would protect the City. There seemed to be three main issues – the need for fee deferrals, security for payment of the deferred fees, and setting a

precedent. Regarding the fee deferrals, even if the development agreement was not approved, no fees would be paid for several years because fees were paid upon occupancy. Since most projects were built to sell, occupancy occurred when the unit was sold so the funds were there to pay the fees. When apartments were built, there were only rents coming in which was the reason for asking for a deferral of the fees until obtaining the permanent financing on the project. They asked for a three-year deferral, but it could be made the first to occur of either the permanent loan or selling the project with three years being the outside. He understood the City's concern regarding security. He was willing to negotiate that as there were other alternatives, such as a letter of credit or a bond. Lastly, there was the fear of setting a precedent and opening the flood gates for other development agreements. There was no comparison between a condominium project, a market-rate project, an already-built project, and one that had not even broken ground. They wanted to sit down with City staff and define a very narrow window of projects that would qualify for fee deferrals with no fear that it would be expanded. They were not looking for approval of the development agreement at this meeting, but hoped the Council would request staff to engage in a dialogue to find a way for this project to move forward.

Mayor Lavagnino stated Mr. Towbes mentioned a letter of credit or bonding. What he had been hearing from City staff was that a letter of credit or bonding was not an option for Mr. Towbes. Santa Maria's impact fees were not the highest in the County, they were about in the middle. He asked if Mr. Towbes would be willing to allow the City to establish a fee schedule before further discussing a development agreement so the City would be reimbursed.

Councilmember Cordero stated Mr. Towbes mentioned it was a $30 million project, but it was not a $30 million infusion into the local community. Some of the products and materials to build this project would come from out of the area. He asked if staff knew how many hours had already been spent on this development agreement.

City Manager Ness stated City-wide it would probably be over 300 hours.

Pat Palangi, Pacifica Commercial Realty, stated he was not involved in this project but was aware of this item and wanted to support this development. He believed that some retailers for the Westgate Ranch shopping center wanted to see additional residential units in the area before committing to commercial leases. He submitted a letter of support.

Laurie Tamura, Urban Planning Concepts, stated they have worked very hard with City staff over the last few years on several projects, including Siena. They thought Siena was a successful project. What they were asking City staff to consider was to work with the developer and be creative and open minded about the opportunities to address a financial issue. This was the best time to try to find a win-win situation. There were times when the City had to step outside the box and work with people who wanted to invest in the City. This was one opportunity where they should all work together and not just say no.

Jeremy Solano stated a lot of Mr. Towbes' construction crew would probably be from out of town which would not bring jobs to City residents. A lot of the investments would be on questionable occupancy. Before the City approved any more housing, it needed to think about long-term employment options. The City already had a large-scale retail and commercial project in the Town Center Mall, half of which was vacant.

Joan Leon, Santa Maria Community Coalition, stated the Coalition supported staff's recommendation. Staff presented good arguments regarding the problems with this proposal. The developer was not only asking for a deferral but also to lower the fees. The Municipal Code defined the development impact fees that were to be charged. The fees were on the City's website so developers could see what the fees would be. Approving a deferral for this project would set a precedent. The purpose of the Growth Mitigation Fees was to have new developments pay their own way. Additional residents would have an impact on City services. A commercial development in that area was not in the best interest of the City. The City was trying to attract businesses to the downtown core. Developers who wanted to build in the City needed to respect the clearly stated fees and policies in the Municipal Code.

Rudy Lokkart, Hayward Lumber Company, stated it has been mentioned that these were tough times. He was representing their existing employees but also the 165 employees who were currently on layoff. What was being asked was not that the fees not be paid, but for negotiation and flexibility. Hayward Lumber was in existence today because it had worked hard to reduce costs and find new ways to market their business in order to keep the doors open. They were asking for the City to be creative.

Robin Hayhurst stated the construction jobs that Mr. Towbes would provide were very much needed. Mr. Towbes was willing to invest private funding in Santa Maria, and the City should be willing to help him make that happen. She said half of her staff was gone, and she no longer had benefits. That was the new reality. Mr. Towbes was not refusing to do anything. The fees were only requested to be deferred. The risk was to Mr. Towbes, not the City.

Kevin Gotchal stated he thought the misunderstanding about the development agreement had been cleared up. It was amazing to him how government said things needed to get rolling again, but then put roadblocks in the way. The City Council was supposed to serve the community and get the road blocks out of the way so business, industry and developers could come in and put people to work. He asked why the City wasn't willing to reduce the fees during this economic time rather than raising them every year. Instead of deferring the fees, he asked why the City couldn't finance the fees for the duration of construction with Mr. Towbes' making monthly payments.

Steve Scott, RW Scott Construction Company, stated he has been in business in Santa Maria for 42 years. He has had the privilege of working with Mr. Towbes for over 35 years. Mr. Towbes demands a quality project that was built for longevity. He asked the City to consider the impacts to local businesses like his from this project. His company bought a lot of materials, fuel, and most of his parts and equipment in Santa Maria, and most of his employees were from Santa Maria.

Bob Hatch, Chamber of Commerce and EDC, stated he believed the City Manager made many compelling arguments. There seemed to be a difference of opinion about this setting a precedent. The Growth Mitigation Fee fund was currently a negative. It was not designed to be deficit spending, it was supposed to be pay-as-you-go. The City could not afford these deferrals. The City Manager talked about the Police and Fire service requests for a development such as this. Growth Mitigation Fees were supposed to help cover that. Mr. Ness talked about the economic impact of this project to the City and said it would be a deficit every year. If the market forces didn't allow this project to move forward at this time, then maybe it should not go forward.

City Manager Ness stated as far as the developer fees, the City's General Plan dictates that development must pay its fair share. Developer fees were generated to pay for infrastructure needed to support that development. Government was on a fixed income and could not just generate revenue out of thin air. If developer fees were reduced, existing residents would have to pick up the cost of new developments. The fiscal relationship between the State and the City was broken and could not be fixed at this time. One of the speakers mentioned they would like to see a more open approach by the City. Mr. Towbes did submit a development agreement proposal. Staff sat down and discussed that with Mr. Towbes and his representatives. Everything that was discussed was greeted with a "no" from Mr. Towbes. Mr. Towbes was not only asking for a 3-year deferral, but also a 30 percent reduction in the four highest, and most important, developer fees amounting to $774,000. The City has not provided any reductions to any residential development. The true housing need in Santa Maria was for low or very low income housing, not market-rate rental apartments. Staff asked Mr. Towbes if he would consider a 10 percent affordable housing component. Mr. Towbes said "no, it would be a deal killer." The interest rate was not discussed tonight. Staff asked for a much higher interest rate than Mr. Towbes proposed. Staff has put in a minimum of 300 hours over the last two years with no compensation. If the Council was to approve a deferral or reduction of developer fees for this project, it would set a precedent for other forms of residential development, other forms of rental housing, as well as other forms of for-sale housing. He was not sure how the City could say no to those developments.

Mayor Lavagnino asked if it was possible for the City to agree to a deferral at an interest rate that was negotiated, not approve a reduction, and work out some wording so this would not set a precedent. He asked the City Attorney if such wording was possible.

City Attorney Trujillo responded that they could attempt to make this project very unique. The problem was that the City would still get requests from other developers. The City would still have to deal with the request over and over, even if there was a way to distinguish this project.

Councilmember Boysen asked when developer fees were normally paid.

City Manager Ness stated the fees were paid at the time a Certificate of Occupancy was issued at the end of construction. If the 211 apartment units were built at one time and a Certificate of Occupancy was requested, all the fees would be due at that time.

Councilmember Boysen asked Mr. Towbes if he had received any deferrals or reductions for the Ralston Courtyards project in Ventura or the Sumida Gardens project in Goleta; and if the City approved the development agreement, what guarantee would the City have that the project would actually be built.

Mr. Towbes stated he did not receive any deferrals or reductions for the other projects. There had never been an approved project that they hadn't built. All he was asking for now was for Council to direct staff to negotiate with them. It was clear from the beginning that staff did not want a development agreement. He would like the opportunity to continue to work with staff to come up with an agreement. He did not think it would set a precedent.

City Manager Ness stated it was unfair for Mr. Towbes to characterize staff as opposed to the development agreement and not willing to negotiate. Staff received the development agreement from Mr. Towbes; and every time staff tried to discuss the issues with Mr. Towbes, they were greeted with a "no." Maybe they could negotiate some of the issues, but he could not get past this setting a precedent. What he would suggest, if Council was willing to set aside the issue of setting a precedent, was to direct staff to work with Mr. Towbes on the major issues and have him put up a deposit to cover staff time.

Councilmember Cordero stated Mr. Gotchal mentioned a payment program, and that was already built in to the fee structure. With the school right there, if there was an accident in front of the gates, they would not be able to get people in or out. He anticipated there would be a need to do some adjustments to the roadway once people moved in, and the Traffic Mitigation Fees would be needed. He questioned entering into further negotiations when staff had been working on this for over two years. He was taken aback with Mr. Towbes comments tonight that he was willing to negotiate. He felt this should not have come to the Council at this time.

City Manager Ness explained that Mr. Towbes was the one who wanted this on the agenda before the City Council. Staff indicated to Mr. Towbes and his representatives that the main issue was the security. He and the Council were responsible for guarding the taxpayers' money. He didn't know how anyone could expect the City to enter into a risky investment with the possibility of default or foreclosure. He told Mr. Towbes the City would need a City-approved form of security, and Mr. Towbes said that was financially impractical.

Councilmember Cordero stated he did not know what good it would do to further negotiate. He was not in favor of the reduction or the proposed development agreement. He agreed that staff should not continue on without being compensated. The Council needed to protect the taxpayers' money.

Councilmember Orach stated he concurred with Councilmember Cordero; however, he knew and trusted Mr. Towbes. It was Council's fiduciary duty to protect the taxpayers' money. For several years this project had moved through several different iterations. He thought the City had tried to work with Mr. Towbes to approve a project for the current market and economy. The City had been sensitive to the developers in this economy and decided to defer increases to the Growth Mitigation Fees this year. He

was not sure that further negotiating was going to do much if the issues had not been settled over the last two years.

Councilmember Patino stated she felt Santa Maria had been a very business-friendly city. She knew the construction industry had been decimated, but so had the City. Development had to pay for itself. She did not see any way around it. To approve reductions in the development fees was wrong. The Council had to be responsible to the taxpayers. She would not be in favor of reducing or deferring the developer fees. The Council was going to have to make some hard choices with the budget at the next meeting that would impact the residents of the City and employees. This was a for-profit project and was market-priced. The Council had heard that the City needed jobs and places for people to live, but it had to be fair to everyone. She felt this would set a precedent.

Councilmember Boysen stated it seemed like the City had been accommodating in the changing market. He didn't know if there were legitimate reasons for reducing fees. He would leave that to City staff. If the Council was going to approve this, there needed to be a policy in place that fee deferrals would be allowed for similar type projects so staff had guidance from the Council. He would never take property rights away from an individual, but these types of projects were expensive for the City. The General Fund would be upside down with this development. He could not condone putting more pressure on the General Fund. He said he would not be opposed if the City could adequately compensate itself with a lucrative interest rate and gain adequate security. He asked Mr. Towbes to come back to staff with his last, best and final offer. He would not support the agreement as proposed.

Councilmember Cordero stated no one could question the credentials of Mr. Towbes. This originally was an R-2 zoned project with condos for sale and was changed to apartments at Mr. Towbes' request. He was told that with units for sale, the fees were paid out of the sale. Mr. Towbes knew when he changed it to apartments that he could not do that. Twenty percent of the existing housing in Santa Maria was already market-rate apartments.

Mayor Lavagnino asked that whoever brought forth a motion would include directing staff to establish a fee structure for future development agreements.

Councilmember Cordero moved to direct staff to pursue a fee structure for development agreements. Councilmember Boysen seconded the motion. It carried on the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Boysen, Cordero, Orach, Patino, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Councilmember Boysen made a motion that Mr. Towbes come back with a last-best and final development agreement that the City could either accept or reject. The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Cordero moved to accept staff's recommendation to not approve the development agreement. Councilmember Boysen seconded the motion.

AYES: Councilmembers Boysen, Cordero, Orach, Patino, and Mayor Lavagnino
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Ness reported that the June 21, 2011, City Council meeting has been reserved for the Mid-Cycle Budget Review.

ORAL REPORTS BY COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Boysen reported he attended the rodeo, the Manufacturer's Association breakfast, met with individuals from the Rotary Club regarding improvement projects at Buena Vista Park, and met with individuals regarding the Day Reporting Center.

Councilmember Patino reported she did the KUHL broadcast with Ben Heighes, met with people from the Salvation Army, attended an award ceremony at the Vet's Clinic for Jack Sutherland, a Peace Week meeting, the Memorial Day ceremony at the Cemetery, the Elks Mini Rodeo, the Elks Parade, the Rodeo, the High Tea Fashion Show, Jeannie Ardantz's Celebration of Life, and Curtis Tunnel's memorial.

Mayor Lavagnino reported he attended the SBCAG and APCD meetings, the Team Hope Walk for Huntington's disease at Waller Park, the High Tea Fashion Show, a preparation lunch meeting for the Mayor's Ball, the Memorial Day ceremony, toured Windset Farms, attended the Elks Mini Rodeo, the Elks Parade, the Celebration of Life for Jeannie Ardantz, and the memorial service for Curtis Tunnell.

Councilmember Orach reported on the LAFCO meeting and attended the Elks Parade and several of the other events his fellow Councilmembers attended.

Councilmember Cordero reported he attended the Orcutt Junior High mock job interviews, the Drug Court graduation, a United Way meeting, a fundraiser at the Boys and Girls Club, the North County Rape Crisis Center Kids Day in the Park, a Peace Week meeting, the Memorial Day service at the cemetery, the Memorial Day service at the Elks Rodeo Grounds, a Boys and Girls Club meeting, the Elks Mini-Rodeo, the Elks Parade, and a meeting with the Rotary Club about projects at Buena Vista Park.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the City Council at this time, the meeting was declared adjourned at 9:00 p.m. by Mayor Lavagnino in honor of Jeannie Ardantz and Curtis Tunnel.

APPROVED

June 21, 2011
Date

Patricia A. Perez
Chief Deputy City Clerk and ex officio Clerk of the City Council

ATTEST

Patricia A. Perez
Chief Deputy City Clerk

J. S. Lavagnino
Mayor